

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-22 are pending. Claims 1-4, 6-8, 10, and 14-20 stand rejected. Claims 5, 9, 11-13, 21, and 22 are objected to.

Claims 1, 6, 14, and 18 have been amended. Claim 16 has been canceled. No claims have been added. Support for the amendments is found in the specification, the drawings, and in the claims as originally filed. Applicants submit that the amendments do not add new matter.

Applicants reserve all rights with respect to the applicability of the Doctrine of Equivalents.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 6-8, 10 and 14-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,526,362 to Thompson et al. (hereinafter "Thompson").

Amended claim 1 reads as follows:

A method of recovering a clock signal for a TDM output from packets of TDM data which have been transmitted over a packet network, from a source having a source TDM clock to a destination having a destination TDM clock, the method comprising: providing at least some packets with a Remote Timestamp, or information from which a Remote Timestamp can be generated, wherein the Remote Timestamp represents the state of the source TDM clock when the packet is created; providing said at least some packets with a Local Timestamp representing the state of the destination TDM clock when the packet is received; determining a Transit Time value representing the difference between said Local and Remote Timestamps; filtering the Transit Time value over time; and controlling the clock frequency of the TDM output only on the basis of said filtered Transit Time as determined above and independently from the depth of a packet buffer.

(Amended claim 1)(emphasis added).

Thompson discloses control of receiver station timing for time-stamped data. More specifically, Thompson discloses the following:

The received data is passed through a buffer to the remainder of the station. A decoder or other suitable means at the receiving station generates an indication of the buffer fill level, and a local time-stamp is also generated. The output timing for the buffer is controlled by a circuit or other suitable means

which is responsive to both a difference value of received and locally generated time-stamps and to a fill level indication related to the buffer fill level.

(Thompson, col. 2, lines 6-14)(emphasis added).

Thus, Thompson merely discloses that controlling of the output timing is responsive [dependent] to both the difference value and the fill level of the buffer. In contrast, amended claim 1 refers to controlling the clock frequency of the TDM output only on the basis of said filtered Transit Time as determined above and independently from the depth of a packet buffer.

Furthermore, Thompson discloses applying an error [difference] signal on line [43] directly to phase lock loop (PLL) [44] (Figure 2). In particular, Thompson discloses that “the ...PLL 44 is utilized to control or clock the reading out data...”(col. 4, lines 15-16).

Thus, Thompson merely discloses applying the error [difference] signal directly to the PLL to control or clock the reading out data. In contrast, amended claim 1 refers to filtering the transit time value over the time, and controlling the clock frequency of the TDM output only on the basis of said filtered Transit Time as determined above and independently from the depth of a packet buffer.

Additionally, Thompson merely discloses “a... time-stamp being an indication of the frequency difference (error) between the incoming signal from the source station, and the network timing reference” (col. 3, lines 12-15). In contrast, amended claim 1 refers to a Remote Timestamp that represents the state of the source TDM clock when the packet is created.

Further, Thompson merely discloses “a time-stamp ...is a function of the difference between the local clock and a standard system clock”(col. 3, lines 61-62). In contrast, amended claim 1 refers to a Local Timestamp representing the state of the destination TDM clock when the packet is received.

Because Thompson fails to disclose all limitations of amended claim 1, applicants respectfully submit that amended claim 1 is not anticipated by Thompson under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

Given that claim 14 contains the limitations that are substantially similar to those discussed with respect to amended claim 1, applicants respectfully submit that amended claim 14 is not anticipated by Thompson under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

Because claims 2-4, 6-8, 10, and 15-20 depend from amended claims 1 and 14 respectively, and add additional limitations, applicants respectfully submit that claims 2-4, 6-8, 10, and 15-20 are not anticipated by Thompson under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

Applicants note with appreciation the Examiner's statement that claim 5, 9, 11-13, 21 and 22 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

At this time, however, applicants elect to not amend claims 5, 9, 11-13, 21 and 22. It is respectfully submitted that in view of the amendments and arguments set forth herein, the applicable rejections and objections have been overcome.

Applicants respectfully submit that the applicable rejections and objections have been overcome.

If there are any additional charges, please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: October 23, 2007

By: 

Lester J. Vincent, Reg. No. 31,460

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, California 94085-4040
(408) 720-8300
Fax No. (408) 720-8383
Customer No. 008791